

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-21 are presently active in this case. The present Amendment amends Claims 1, 8 and 12, cancels Claim 2 and 15, and adds new Claim 21. The above Amendment shows all the currently active claims and their respective status for the Examiner's convenience.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 4-8, 11-13 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Japanese reference JP-07136599A (hereinafter "the '599 reference"). Claims 1, 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Sticht (U.S. Patent No. 5,053,173, hereinafter "the '173 patent"). Claims 2, 9 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the '599 reference taken together with Applicant's admitted prior art, Figures 1A, 1B and pages 1-3 of the specification. Claims 3, 10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the '599 reference taken together with the '173 patent.

In response to the rejection of claims 1, 4-8, 11-13 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by the '599 reference and rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 7 as anticipated by the '173 patent Applicant has amended Claims 1, 8 and 12 to define over this reference. Claim 1 now recites "a plurality of holes configured in a row through which air is blown to the surface of the mold die set." The '599 reference does not teach or suggest a plurality of holes

configured in a row through which air is blown. Further, the '173 patent does not teach or suggest a plurality of holes configured in a row. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that in light of the above amendment, Claim 1 and those claims that depend therefrom are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Claim 8 now recites a plurality of nozzles "configured on a first nozzle block and a plurality of nozzles configured on a second nozzle block" to define over the '599 reference. The '599 reference, for example, in Fig. 7, clearly shows the spray nozzles being attached to a top surface of the brush block. Likewise, the '173 patent does not teach or suggest a nozzles configured on first and second nozzle blocks. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 8 and those claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

The subject matter of a modified Claim 15 has been incorporated into Claim 12. Claim 12 now recites "a first and second plurality of holes configured in a row on the mold die set cleaner through which air is blown to the first surface of the mold die set." Applicants respectfully submit that the '599 reference does not teach or suggest a mold die set cleaner with a first and second plurality of holes configured in a row through which air is blown. Further, the '173 patent does not teach or suggest a plurality of holes configured in a row.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12 and those that depend therefrom are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Further, new Claim 21 has been added which recites "the plurality of nozzles and plurality of holes are coplanar." Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 21 is also patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Now turning to the rejection of Claims 2, 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the '599 reference together with Applicant's admitted prior art and pages 1-3 of the specification. In light of the above discussion and claim amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that even if the '599 reference was combined with Applicant's admitted prior art even the proposed combination fails to teach all the recited features of the amended claims. Thus, the rejection to Claims 2, 9 and 14 is believed to be overcome in light of their dependencies to independent Claims 1, 8 and 12.

In response to the rejection of Claims 3, 10 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the '599 reference taken together with the '173 patent, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3 and 15 have been canceled, rendering these rejections moot. Applicants further submit that even the proposed combination of references does not teach or suggest "a plurality of nozzles configured on a first nozzle block and a plurality of nozzles configured on a second nozzle block" as is recited in independent claim 8. Thus, in light of the above discussion and claim amendments, the rejection of Claim 10 is believed to be overcome and Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of above remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding rejection and allowance of pending claims 1, and 3-14 and 16-21 is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Timothy J. Maier, Reg. No. 51,986, at the number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Very truly yours,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC

By


John A. Castellano
Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000

JAC/TJM:jcp